UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese } ***Associate Editors***

The Hitler Horror

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Among Men

By ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Do We Need a New Moral Outlook?

By JOHN H. DIETRICH

Montaigne

By GEORGE LINNAEUS THOMPSON

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 5

Chicago, April 3, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
The Hitler Horror—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 67
Notes 68
Among Men—ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY 69
Jottings—J. H. H. 70

ARTICLES—
Do We Need a New Moral Outlook?—JOHN H. DIETRICH 71
Montaigne—GEORGE LINNAEUS THOMPSON 76

POETRY—
Germany, Awake! (March, 1933)—LOUIS GINSBERG 77
While the World Flounders—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 77
Nocturne of 1933—ELIOT WHITE 77
Judas' Feet—RAYMOND KRESENSKY 77

THE STUDY TABLE—
Russia and Armenia—ALICE STONE BLACKWELL 78

CORRESPONDENCE—
From an American Friend in Russia—H. 79
Peace and the Idea of God—JOHN T. RICKETT 79

THE FIELD—
The Anti-Untouchability Movement—EDITH HUNTER 66
Munition Makers Corrupt Statesmen—*The Christian Leader* 80
New Organization for Freedom of Expression 80

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Anti-Untouchability Movement

By Edith Hunter

It is not easy to give a clear description of the manifold activities of the Anti-Untouchability Movement which arose out of Mahatma Gandhi's fast. Everyone who is interested in the welfare of India should realize the far-reaching significance of the movement—the deep-seated inwardness of the reform, its potential influence for the future and its significance for other countries which pride themselves on being free from this particular evil. Mahatma Gandhi voiced his ideas for the campaign in a statement too long to quote in full, but perhaps a few of his expressed ideals and practical directions for work may give some idea of the whole movement. He first dwells on the position of the caste Hindus whom he believes to have sinned in their attitude to the Untouchables—the former, he says, must repent and purify themselves by removing the "load of untouchability from the backs" of the others. This in itself would effect a transformation in the habits of the Untouchables, and although this process will be slow, every amenity must be given in the meantime to assist, to educate and reassure those whose "birth constitutes an automatic cause for penal servitude for life."

The Mahatma asserts that the sin of untouchability does not need the evidence of the Shastras, but because there are those who invoke this authority in justification of the present caste attitude, he stresses the advisability of obtaining knowledge of this kind and of patient educational methods in dealing with such opponents. There must be no coercion but adversaries must be overcome and converted by self-suffering and by making common cause with the depressed people.

"In this program Temple-entry occupies the most important place," this is the assertion of the Mahatma which is adhered to after admitting that reform of the Temples is needed also. He continues, "Village Temples were and even now are, places of refuge for villagers," and therefore they must be open to them in exactly the same way as they are to the others. The Mahatma visualizes a great new awakening and a complete change of attitude among high-caste Hindus which will have a far-reaching reciprocal effect on all classes of the community.

On the practical plane he suggests that high-caste families should adopt a child or take a servant from the Untouchables — that meals should be taken together and the other social functions should be shared. Harijan children should be fed and the sick cared for; the amount of monetary help forthcoming would constitute an index of sincerity and support. Social

(*Continued on page* 80)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, APRIL 3, 1933 Number 5

The Hitler Horror

Not since the Russian pogroms in the old days of the Tsar, or even the Armenian massacres at the hands of the "Unspeakable Turk," has the world witnessed such a horror as that now being perpetrated in Germany by the Hitler tyranny. With a speed and a fury unanticipated even by those who have taken the National Socialist movement with the utmost seriousness from the beginning, the new rulers of the Reich have established a "reign of terror" and are bathing it in blood. German liberals of all schools, founders and servants of the Republic, independent workingmen of the Social Democratic Party, Communists of the "red" Left, all these have fallen under the ban of dictatorial displeasure and are feeling the iron rod. But chiefly the Jews of all ranks and stations, rich and poor, high and low, famous and obscure, are being thrust beneath the yoke of oppression. Once again the children of Jesus's tribe are laid low beneath the scorpion whips of prejudice, hate, and violent persecution. Outlawed from the land which they have made their own and to which they have contributed much of its noblest culture, robbed and ravaged, insulted and degraded, hunted, hounded, spat upon and massacred, this wretched folk again tread the *Via Dolorosa* and climb the hill of crucifixion.

The stories coming these days from Germany would be incredible if they were not associated with the man whose name has become a thing of horror. Wild bands of armed ruffians roam the streets of cities and towns, and scour the countryside, in search of Jews whom they may bait and butcher. They enter their houses and ravish their property. They close their stores and shops, violate their privileges of trade, and thus deny them livelihood. These gangsters hunt Jews as they would hunt rats—driving them from home and shelter, pursuing them into dark alleys or open fields, whipping them, beating them, treading them under foot, and at last in sadist joy slaying them. Jews in any position of life are denied the protection of the law, the rights of manhood, and the well-earned privileges of personal service and distinction. Jewish professors are driven from their classrooms, judges from their courts, physicians from their hospitals, scientists from their laboratories, actors from the stage, and artists from the concert halls. Bruno Walter cannot lift his baton over a German orchestra, Theodore Wolff has fled from his newspaper office and gone into hiding, Lion Feuchtwanger is in exile in Switzerland, and Albert Einstein in a hasty haven in Belgium. Fame and power give no protection in this dread hour, as weakness moves no pity. An entire people, millions of scholars, artists, writers, teachers, professional men, merchants, workers, householders, housewives, old men and women who have given their all and young men and women who have pledged their all to the Rhineland, the best blood and substance of the realm, German Jews than whom there is no nobler tribe in culture and spirit, these again, as in the bleak darkness of the Middle Ages, are doomed to persecution and destruction. Streets in Germany run blood, skies re-echo cries of pain, and frontiers swarm with refugees. This is the pogrom again. This is barbarism come back to life. Thus is our stricken world engulfed at last in ancient savagery.

What America can do in this awful hour seems little enough. But she can at least lift up her cry in grief and wrath. She can protest to the high heaven of God's pity. She can speak in such a thunder of her myriad voices, that even a Hitler may give heed. The Jews of this country are already springing to their brethren's help. Vast meetings, gathered in synagogues and public buildings, have called to one another as beacon fires enkindle light from shore to shore, and made Israel in this land one mighty shout of protest. Let Christians follow them, in the name of the Nazarene, Judaea's son, whom they worship as Lord and Savior! Let every Christian minister denounce Hitler, every congregation adopt resolutions of denunciation of his acts, every council and conclave give clamor to conscience in rebuke of his base cruelty. This is no time for moderation or patience. The very altars of the churches should

rock with wrath, and their crosses bleed with shame. If Christianity is not a thing of rank pretense and foul hypocrisy, let the faith now speak, or else forever hold its peace!

What more may be done will soon be known. Representatives to the administration in Washington should force the government to speak to Hitler today, as it was wont in former days to speak to Tsar and Sultan. At such an hour, in such a terror, our nation, which has its ambassador in Berlin, and gives therewith its recognition to the Reich, cannot evade responsibility of action on behalf of justice, mercy, and world-wide brotherhood. Then there remain the fierce weapons of the embargo, the denial of trade relations and cultural courtesies, the banning of a state not fit to live in the society of civilization.

Not only for Jews, but for Germans, we present our plea. If Israel dies, it is the Fatherland that kills. It cannot be the will of the German people, whom we know and love so well, that these horrors shall be done. These people are innocent of the offense of the wild ruffians who have seized the Reich and are using it to their mad uses—innocent, at least, until by their silence and inaction they give consent to Hitler! Let the Jews be saved, and let the Germans save themselves, that this dark hour of destiny be not swallowed up at last by the black midnight of mankind's utter horror and despair.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

President Roosevelt has without any question caught the imagination of the country. He was fortunate, from the psychological point of view, in coming into office at the very tip-top of the banking crisis. Something had to be done, and done at once; and anything of a decisive nature was bound to win applause. It should be said that the President took full advantage of the situation. He maintained a mien of cheer and courage, which stayed the panic which was threatening to sweep the country. He took action which was prompt, aggressive, clean-cut, and which therefore, gave the people the comforting assurance that something was being done. Best of all, he took the nation into his confidence by using the radio with an effectiveness never known before. The net result of those first few days of the administration was the sense, everywhere diffused, that a clear mind and a strong hand were in command of the ship of state, and that the storm therefore could be weathered. This was a priceless achievement at such a moment, and in word and gesture showed Mr. Roosevelt at his best. But as this emergency action has taken us forward not one step upon the road of recovery, so it has told us nothing of the real capacity of the new President for public leadership. The real order of his statesmanship will become apparent when he presents his plan for remaking the banking system of this country, his program for the handling of the international situation, his policies for the relief of the farmers, his projects for cutting down the mass of unemployment and organizing the work of relief. Of these major measures, only the farm bill has been reported at this writing, and it is hardly reassuring. A hopeless hodge-podge of old discredited expedients and new untried experiments, it seems to indicate a return of the nation to the floundering futility of Hoover's last three years. What is needed in this direful hour is action which will remake our collapsing social order. Now is the time to do things which have never been done before because they could not be done when things were going fairly well. Half-measures are of no avail. Hew to the line, Mr. President, or you will fail and fall!

What stirred commendation in President Roosevelt's record in the first days of his administration was a certain willingness upon his part to take responsibility and to act upon it. This was seen at its best in his insistence upon grappling with the veterans' benefits scandal and strangling the life out of it. If Mr. Roosevelt actually cuts down federal expenditures by his promised $400,000,000 on this item, his glory will be in exact proportion to the shame of Congress in not daring to take this step. But there is another side to this business, already referred to in these columns, which is so disquieting as to demand further consideration. In all that President Roosevelt did in those early days he acted as a dictator. His one demand was that Congress should surrender its constitutional prerogatives and give him all-power. Our democracy, in other words, was and is upset, and a full-fledged dictatorship of the Mussolini type established in its place. The Banking Bill gave the President such powers as only the imperial tyrants of history have enjoyed, and yet it was passed with such speed that the bill was not printed and the Congressmen had no knowledge of what they were voting for. The Economy Bill divested the legislature of its age-old appropriation privileges, and handed over supreme control to the executive. The new farm relief bill makes the Secretary of Agriculture a tsar of the first order. Is this the way that Mr. Roosevelt intends to rule? It's the easy way, of course—anybody can rule who has nobody to consult but himself! But it's not the democratic way, and we refuse to yield to the plea of emergency, always invoked to justify high-handed action of this type, to satisfy our conscience. If a dictatorship comes in this

country it will come precisely in this way—with the best of intentions, and with everybody satisfied. That is the reason why we believe that the opposition Senators, the best men in the upper chamber, did the nation a priceless service in resisting Mr. Roosevelt's exactions. Borah, LaFollette, Cutting, Shipstead, Nye, Couzens, Frazier, Dickinson, voted against the Economy Bill. Practically the same men stood against the Banking Bill. All honor to them! Like the Senators who voted against the War under the whip-lash of Woodrow Wilson's displeasure, they will be acclaimed in days to come for their fidelity to the Republic.

The British White Paper, announcing a so-called Federal Constitution for India, is a matter of little interest and no importance. In its essential content, it is not a grant of self-government at all, but only a statement of reservations upon such self-government. It is an announcement to all and sundry that India need expect nothing in the way of British concession to her demands for liberty. Even moderate Indians are outraged by the MacDonald proposals. Thus, Mr. C. Y. Chintamani, editor of the Allahabad *Leader,* a prominent liberal and a delegate to the London Round Table Conference, denounces the White Paper as a "Black Outlook," and asserts that "the British proposals do not fulfil even fractionally the test of responsible government." One may imagine, from this statement by one of the most conciliatory of Indian leaders, what is the reaction of the All-India Congress. Opposition from Gandhi down will of course be adamant, and the situation move on as though a little pebble had been cast into a seething flood. The real problem at this moment is not what India is going to do. This we know from months of heroic endurance of a tyranny as brutal and vicious as that which is ravaging Germany at this moment. No question but what India will carry on, at whatever price, till liberty is won. The problem today is what will Britain do! With the Indian Nationalists in Bombay united with the Tory die-hards in London against this ridiculous legislation, MacDonald's government is impaled on the two horns of as absurd a dilemma as history can show. There is no progress in this direction. The Empire must either grant full independence to the Indian people, or else grant them some such measure of independence as they not so long ago granted the Irish people. In which latter case, the Indians will imitate the Irish in using their partial freedom to achieve their full freedom. So it is independence in any case!

Has our climate changed, or is it changing? A long succession of mild winters in these northern latitudes, with little snow and sustained cold, would seem to indicate that some meteorological transformation is going on. Popular conviction is certainly all that way. Childish memories are, of course, inaccurate—a snowdrift is twice or three times as high to a boy as to a man, and one big storm in early youth will make an impression which only grows with the years. Nevertheless, with every reservation taken into account, we still insist that there were winters a generation ago which have long since become unknown. Suppose we had sleighs now instead of automobiles—how often would we be able to use them? How many modern boys, even in the rural districts, have ever seen sleds, or "double runners," or toboggans? Why do we have "snow trains" these days to find and transport people to some distant place where there is actually some snow? Something has happened in recent years—this is not the same climate it used to be! And it would seem as though this were a world-wide phenomenon. Thus, we were struck recently by a report from our editorial correspondent, Dr. Sydney Strong, who spent the Christmas season and part of January in Moscow, that he saw no snow in this capital city of the Russian Soviets. Imagine Moscow without snow! What would Napoleon have thought? Apparently, if the Emperor had made his famous Russian campaign this year instead of in 1812, he would have encountered no difficulties from severe weather, but carried through his vast undertaking to a triumph, and thus changed the history of the world. Of course, it may be possible that we are moving through some vast cycle—a period of warm seasons, to be succeeded eventually by another period of arctic temperature. Official records do not run back far enough to give us data upon which to base conclusions on this point. But for the present, at least, we are having an easy time of it. If things keep on, we shall expect to see orange groves on Long Island, palm trees in Massachusetts, and cotton plantations in Illinois.

Among Men

The rich full life has been a goal which men have in all ages set for themselves. The ways to that end have been many and many who have gone these ways have failed in their quest. Life is filled with frustrations. We are defeated and often broken in the storm and stress of it. For many it is meager, poor human souls that have struggled in vain.

The struggle to rise above one's environment, to escape the soul deadening process of life itself has caused many to seek a way of escape, to find in solitude and loneliness the *summum bonum* of existence. The hermit despairs of life. He seeks to escape from it.

His action is a denial of life itself. He seeks, withdrawn from his fellows, to purify his soul and attain richness and fullness of life for himself. The whole theory back of the monastic life is the same. It is a denial of the natural processes. It is an affirmation that the good life cannot be lived among men, that the human soul is too weak to withstand the stress that comes with the impact of soul on soul.

Art has been used as a method of escape from life, with the dim hope that somehow, through this escape the goal may be attained. From this point of view art is utterly unrelated to life. Art for art's sake, rather than art for life's sake, becomes a principle of action. In a world of beauty, devoid of all human significance, men seek the same end as the hermits seek. All through the ages men have been running away from life in a vain effort to find the very thing from which they flee.

Goethe said, "Man finds himself among men." There is the story of the ship at sea whose water supply was exhausted. The crew was desperate. Death stared them in the face. Another ship was seen approaching. The sailors were roused from their despair. As the ship of their salvation came near the captain cried: "Water! We are out of water! Can you spare us a cask?" The reply came back over the waters, "Put down your buckets anywhere. You are in the mouth of the River Amazon." The source of richness of life is not over there, but here, all about us.

Man reaches the fullness of his experience not alone, but with others. The largest experience comes not with the denial but with the acceptance of the conditions through which the souls of men are tried and tested. The law of our being is that of association. We find ourselves through our contacts with others. The very defeats, disappointments and frustrations that distress us are, as Browning says, but "the stuff to try men's souls on."

As a matter of fact, countless millions of people cannot withdraw from life. They are caught in the wheels of the industrial world. For them there can be no haven of solitude, no quiet resting place. If they are to find at all any loveliness or beauty they must find it where Goethe says all life must be found, among men. There is something that is a little bit smug when men say, "Go to, now, I'll withdraw and enrich my soul." Life is not as simple as all that. The best in man comes when he is most tested. The getting together of good people, as such, has a Pharisaic taint to it. The beautiful life seems to grow out of the muck. The modern saints, if we have any saints, live in this work-a-day world. They do the work that comes to hand. They associate with all kinds and conditions of people. They do not withdraw themselves, but rather find themselves in the sorrow, misery, suffering, joy and laughter of people. For them there are no saved or unsaved, no good or bad people, but rather people in the process of development, and whatever of glory or beauty there is in their lives comes through a sense of their sharing in a common process.

These modern saints are mostly sinners, from the standpoint of the "unco' good." One finds them in the most unexpected places. Even as saints of past ages these modern saints have to die to attain their glory. So perhaps in some distant age not only will Jane Addams attain her aureole but even Clarence Darrow will have reached the blessedness of sainthood. It is of these that Browning sang:

Up and down amid men, heart by heart fare we!
Welcome squalid vesture, harsh voice, hateful face!
God is soul, souls I and thou; with souls should souls have place.

ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY.

Jottings

We were wrong last week! The old-fashioned bank "receiver" has been displaced not by a "conserver" but by a *"conservator."* But it's all the same in the end. You lose your money!

Speaking of words! Some one has suggested that we drop the word "banker," and substitute a new word, *"bankster."* We second the motion! "Bankster" is a word which we shall add fondly to that other prize word, "patrioteer."

As though there were not already enough trouble in this country, California has to give us an earthquake and Kansas a cyclone. These are terrible visitations, but they have at least the one comfort that they are not the consequence of our own greed and folly.

Ever since we can remember we have been reading about reforms for the doing away with money. And now we find that we don't need any reforms! The banks are doing the trick.

The students of the University of Glasgow have now joined the students of Oxford and Manchester (see UNITY, March 27th) in voting not to bear arms for King or country. What college in America will be the first to join this war resisters group?

We know that American women are beautiful. They can actually wear their present little monkey-hats, and not look like perfect guys. J. H. H.

Do We Need a New Moral Outlook?

We are accustomed to hear it said that our age is an age of transition. Every progressive people is always in a stage of transition, but the rapidity with which we have been changing in the sphere of religion and morality has never been greater than it is now. During the past thirty or forty years a number of factors have deeply influenced and transformed religion and consequently the moral outlook. Perhaps the most important of these were the doctrine of evolution and the so-called higher criticism. The former has changed man's whole point of view and has wrought a veritable revolution in every phase of human thought; while the latter has so transformed the traditional view of the Bible that it is now placed in the same class as the other great books embodying the aspiration and inspiration of a race. It is conceded to be at least a historical and not an absolute revelation.

But beside the doctrine of evolution and the higher criticism, the general advance in all branches of the physical sciences has had a great influence on some of the cardinal beliefs of modern Christianity. Never before has such progress been made in the various physical sciences. One of the practical results of this increase of knowledge has been to weaken, I might say to destroy, the belief of well-informed people in the intervention of a divine power in physical events. It is not so very long ago that almost everyone had no doubt as to the possibility of interference on the part of the Creator in physical affairs, and their prayers were made up of petitions for this intervention. This is no longer true. Enlightened Christians have lost faith, either in the power or the willingness of God to interfere with the mechanical working of the universe. It is true that we hear of Christians who still believe in such things and pray for physical benefits; but these belong to the less-informed ranks of the Christian Church.

Now if faith in God had been shaken only in this particular respect, as to his power or willingness to modify physical events, not much harm would have been done to the Christian Church and very little effect would have been produced upon the popular mind. But a more important result of the recent gains in science has been to disturb the accepted belief in the power of God to make his will felt in the world of thought and feeling, which strikes at the very heart of Christianity, for once this is gone the Christian Church becomes almost unrecognizable. But even this is not the most important result to religion and ethics of the recent gains in science. The most important consequence of all is the breakdown of belief in God as the author of morality and the judge of moral deeds and the enforcer of moral law. The great mass of humanity has always believed that the moral law was enacted by God, that it was interpreted by God, and that disobedience to it was punished by God; and with the belief in this kind of God has gone the reason for paying any attention to the moral law at all.

Now shall we rejoice at this loss of a cardinal faith or shall we lament as did the great English scientist, Romanes, when he had to give up the belief in a divine providence? We may indeed be delighted that what we call a superstition has fallen to the ground; but those whose hearts are yearning for a more enriched individual life and a better world cannot help but feel that a great danger lies in the passing away of such a belief. The belief in such a God has been of inestimable moral support to multitudes of people. The belief in a perfect judge, a great helper, a kindly father, has been a source of immeasurable strength to humanity; and the loss of it is, in this respect at least, a misfortune upon which we must look with grave concern. By whom and how is this loss to be met? By those who have discarded the belief in a transcendent and responsive God. The task as it appears to me is just this and no less than this: To replace the great father; to provide for those who needed him that which they were in the habit of receiving from him; and to replace the great enforcer of the moral law with new sanctions for doing what is right. This duty falls upon the individual and society at large. Men must so organize their boundless physical and moral resources as to multiply steadfast and intelligent friendships, so that all the unsatisfied cravings of a yearning soul shall find their remedy in human fellowship and in varied social activities. In like manner we must teach men the natural and actual reasons why what we call the moral law should be observed, so that their moral satisfactions may arise from the mere fact of doing right rather than of pleasing God.

Is it possible for man to provide such a substitute—I do not say for God—but for the belief in the particular God of which I have been speaking? I believe that it is. If I did not so believe, I should feel that we were facing a very dark future. My personal opinion is that humanity will succeed in adjusting itself to this change with only temporary loss to some individuals, and certainly with absolute final gain. The loss of the transcendent father will hasten the establishment of the kingdom of heaven on earth, for it will make us feel our mutual dependence more keenly, and it will help us develop a morality based upon the love of good rather than the fear of punishment. This conviction rests in the first place upon the observation that God never did what he was supposed to do for man; and in the second place upon a faith in the growing goodness of man. But this change in our conception of God is the first reason for our need of a new moral outlook; and it is this reason which I shall now consider more at length.

I.

In view of this general breakdown of the belief in a supernatural God, it is necessary to show people that morality is natural and not statutory; that it is a very part of man's mental structure, developed by evolution, and not something apart from man and thrust upon him; that it is composed of the laws which make for individual and social welfare, wrought out of man's experience, and not of arbitrary commandments handed down by a supernatural being. It is this natural and human morality, necessary to the enrichment of the individual life as well as to the perfection of the social order, that men need to understand if they are to live the good life. In other words, we must provide a new

sanction for morality; a natural sanction instead of the old supernatural one; a rational reason for considering obedience to the moral law imperative. In order that this may be done we must teach men the natural origin and the actual meaning of morality; and this I consider a very important subject in a practical sense. Too much prominence cannot be given to the origin and nature of morality. I cannot agree with a noted ethicist whose book I read recently, when he says: "For practical purposes it is comparatively unimportant how this moral standard arose." In my humble opinion it is very important for the reason that the kind of morality a man has will depend upon his conception of whence it came and what it is. As soon as the evolutionary theory of the origin of morals has been accepted, great strides in the development of an improved morality will surely follow.

The origin of morality is a long story and a very fascinating one. I can merely suggest the contrast which must be held before the eyes of men. So long as men believed in what I might call supernatural morality, the study of its origin was comparatively simple. The supernaturalist presupposes the existence of a God who is a moral being, in fact a perfect moral being; and this God with his perfect knowledge of what is right and what is wrong, has in times past imparted some of this knowledge to man. In fact, he has with his own finger written on tablets of stone some of the more important moral precepts as embodied in the Ten Commandments. Therefore it is right to obey these commandments and wrong to disobey them. It is wrong to steal because God said: "Thou shalt not steal;" and it is wrong to commit murder because God said: "Thou shalt not kill." In other words, supernatural morality is founded on the arbitrary commands of a supernatural being. Men are good, if they are good, because God told them to be good; and they know what is right from wrong, because God told them what is right and what is wrong. Men have differed as to the channel through which this knowledge came, some insisting that it came through the Bible, others that it came through the church, and still others that it came through the individual conscience; but they all agreed as to its source.

But with the breakdown of supernatural religion we get the collapse of these stupendous claims in regard to the origin of morality; and if we would know something of this origin we turn naturally to a study of the origin and development of man; and in this study we realize that men have found out what is right and wrong in their relations with other men, just as they have found out what is good to eat and what is poison—by experience; that morality is simply the knowledge of conditions that make for life which have been gained as a result of the experience of the race. Right is nothing more nor less than an idea, a word, by which we express the truth that has been wrought out of human experience that certain kinds of thinking, certain ways of feeling, certain methods of conduct, are helpful to man while others are harmful. We know today that stealing and killing are wrong, not because some imaginary being in the skies said so; but because they are inimical both to the individual and the group life; and this is the real reason why they have been made moral prohibitions, their source having been assigned to the gods later in order to give them authority.

As a matter of experience certain things have been found to be injurious to man, either individually or socially. These when done by men themselves and of their own accord, are spoken of as bad and wrong. Other things have been found to be helpful to men—they prolong his life or increase his happiness—these things when done voluntarily are called good and right. And so more or less general ideas of what good and bad, what right and wrong, are have arisen in the world. They are not terms that mean anything in themselves; they are simply summary expressions for a lot of experience as to how different courses of conduct work among men. We have found, for instance, that intemperance is harmful to man, and we call it wrong. We have found that unrestrained indulgence in sexual appetite is harmful to man, and we call that wrong. Wrong in general is simply a term to cover these and other similar indulgences that we have discovered to be prejudicial to human life. So with the term morality in its social application. The race did not at first have the idea of morality and then inquire whether this, that, and the other thing, were moral. By actual and tolerably uniform experience it learned that while some things were injurious and disintegrating to society, other things were useful and fortifying; and these last it came to designate as morality. Refraining from hurting one another, refraining from stealing one another's property, refraining from injuring one another's reputation—these things the members of a community would find tended to build up the community and make it strong; and still more would be keeping their word with one another and caring for one another; in short, truth, affection, public spirit—these are the things we lump together and call morality.

I do not mean by this that the right and wrong of everything has been decided; for in fact there are whole regions of conduct that are as yet most imperfectly explored. I only mean that some exploring has already been done; that mankind has not been searching all these ages and finding nothing; that some conditions of social and physical welfare have been learned—these conditions being indicated in such fundamental virtues and principles of action as I have referred to and summed up in the expression—morality. The whole meaning of morality simply simmers down to this: that there are certain conditions according to which life must be lived; and that if we knew all of these conditions then the right and wrong of everything would be determined, because right action is that action which tends to the preservation and enrichment of both the individual and social life, and wrong action is that which tends to the destruction and impoverishment of life. So the real standard of morality is the laws of the universe and of social organization which form the condition of life and which fall within our realm of knowledge.

Now what is our sanction for morality? Why should a man observe these moral laws? That question is answered the moment you ask another question as to the purpose of life. What is life for? The only answer I have ever been able to give to

this question is that life is to live. What is the end and aim of life? Why, life itself. What is it that men are striving for? Why, life—the full free, rich, abundant life. The supreme and perfect end of life is to live. As Tennyson puts it:

> 'Tis life whereof our nerves are scant,
> Oh, life, not death, for which we pant;
> More life, and fuller, that we want.

This great desire for life, coupled with the knowledge that those things which foster, enlarge, liberate and ennoble the lives of men are right; while those feelings and courses of conduct which weaken, enslave, degrade, impoverish and destroy life are wrong, gives us the perfect moral sanction, the strongest motive in the world for doing right.

II.

Now in accordance with this evolutionary idea of morality there is another sense in which we are greatly in need of a new moral outlook, this in regard to the application of morality rather than to its sanction. Those of us who are acquainted with the growth and development of our social organization are fully aware of the fact that the world is constantly outgrowing its institutions, systems, laws, customs and beliefs, just as a boy outgrows his clothes. The very best of them become obsolete in time, because of entirely changed conditions, and must be discarded. This is just as true of our system of morality as it is of our system of education; and it is especially noticeable after some great revolution has entirely changed the conditions of life. We hear a great deal about revolutions, past and present; but we hear very little of one really significant revolution in the history of man. I refer of course to the industrial revolution which took place about a century and a half ago. While political revolutions have had a considerable effect upon the lives of men, the industrial revolution has completely transformed the conditions of life upon this planet. I trust that you are all acquainted with the history of that revolution and its effect on civilized society. If not, you had better study that period, for no one can understand the present situation without a knowledge of this great industrial upheaval.

For some reason, about the middle of the 18th century the genius of man turned itself to the invention of machinery, and thereby completely transformed the methods of creating and distributing the material necessities of life. Here within a period of only a few years inventions and discoveries were made which changed the whole face of the industrial world. Men found themselves working, thinking, and feeling in relation to an environment which, both in its worldwide extension and in its intimate connection with all sides of human existence, was without precedent in the history of the world. The little individual workshops in which each man worked for himself, with complete control over his hours and his conditions of labor, gave way to the great roaring factories in which each man became the wage-slave of an industrial monarch. The little cottages scattered throughout the country, in which each man was his own landlord, had his own well, kept his own cow, and split his own wood, disappeared; and the great industrial centers with their crowded tenement houses arose, in which a man is dependent upon others for every necessity of human existence. Today the great majority of people in industrial countries live in huge commercial cities or in densely populated industrial districts. These cities and districts are only parts of highly organized states, each with fifty to one hundred millions of people. These states even are bound together in a very close and complex commercial relationship.

Perhaps the best illustration of this great change is to be found in our own country. One hundred years ago the population of the United States was about five millions. Today it is one hundred and five millions. One hundred years ago it was chiefly agricultural and the cities were few and comparatively unimportant. Today more than one-half of the people live in cities, and more than one-tenth of the entire population live in the three largest cities: New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia. One hundred years ago the population of New York City was thirty thousand. Today it is practically six millions. One hundred years ago there stood on the southern shore of Lake Michigan a fort with a population of less than fifty people. Today on that same site stands the second largest city in the country, with a population of nearly three millions. On the banks of the Mississippi, where I happen to live, there was absolutely nothing one hundred years ago; while today we have the Twin Cities with a population of nearly three-quarters of a million. Similar changes have taken place in every great industrial country, and a little thought will suggest the tremendous significance of these changes introduced by the industrial revolution. The real significance is suggested by Woodrow Wilson in his "The New Freedom." He says:

> Ever since society began men were related to one another as individuals. . . . Now the everyday relationships of men are largely with great impersonal concerns, with complex organizations, not with other individual men. . . This is nothing short of a new social age, a new era of human relationships, a new stage setting for the drama of life.

Now this is wonderfully significant in the consideration of the need of a new moral outlook. The old ethical system in which we have been trained deals almost exclusively with individual relationships. This was perfectly natural, because the complex social relationships with which we are familiar had not yet come into existence. The real evils then were those committed by one individual against another individual. But today our moral problems are no longer the old individual problems, for we all live our lives in a vast network of social relations where the old moral laws do not seem to apply. Practically all the things which a generation ago individual men did for themselves are now done for them by groups of people over which they have no control. In those days if a man wanted water he went out to his well and drew a pail of water. Today he must take the kind of water that is supplied him by the city in which he lives. If then he wanted milk he went out and milked his cow. Today he is absolutely dependent upon the great milk corporations for milk for his children. In those days if he desired fuel he went and chopped down a tree and split it into wood. But today he is entirely dependent upon the coal trust to keep

himself warm. As Professor Ross of the University of Wisconsin says:

> My vital interests are now entrusted to others. Nowadays the water main is my well; the trolley car my carriage; the banker's safe my old stocking; the policeman's billy my fist. I rely upon others to look after my drains, invest my savings, nurse my sick, and teach my children. I let the meat trust butcher my pig, the oil trust mould my candles, the sugar trust boil my sorghum, the coal trust chop my wood, the steel trust split my rails.

This inter-dependence puts us at one another's mercy and so ushers in a multitude of new forms of wrongdoing, with the result that people do not see (to use Professor Ross' words again) that "boodling is treason; that blackmail is piracy; that embezzlement is theft; that speculation is gambling; that tax dodging is larceny; that railroad discrimination is treachery; that child labor is slavery; that adulteration is murder." We do not realize today that, as Jacob Riis used to say: "You can as surely kill a man with a rotten tenement house as with an axe." And I judge that for everyone killed with an axe there are hundreds killed by rotten tenements. In the former case the murder is avenged while in the latter no one even knows or cares who the murderer is. The mob is infuriated at one who murders another individual, while it views with indifference the crooked mine inspector, the seller of infected milk, the maintainer of a firetrap theatre, all of whom murder by wholesale instead of retail. It throws up its hands in horror at the man who beats a child, but the exploiter of infant toil and the concocter of soothing syrups for the drugging of babies stands a pillar of society. The petty shoplifter is more abhorred than the stealer of a franchise, and the wife beater is cast out long before the man who sends his over-insured ship to sea to founder with its crew. The community is simply appalled at a man who assaults a woman, but not a single hand is raised against the social system that drives thousands of women on to the streets.

And so we find ourselves today facing situations with which our old morality does not deal, and the old question of right and wrong is not so simple as it once was. This does not mean that there is any variation in the principles of right and wrong as I enunciated them a moment ago. The moral principles are the same but we have outgrown their old individualistic forms and they must be translated into their social equivalent, so that we will cease to condemn only the man who steals a loaf of bread, while we pay honor to the man who steals a million dollars; so that we will cease to condemn only the man who beats a child, while we honor the man who kills thousands of children by means of child labor; so that we will cease to condemn only the man who assaults a woman, while we respect the man who by means of economic pressure robs a thousand women of their honor. The moral unrest of our times I think is largely due to the inadequacy of the old system which deals only with individual relations and knows nothing of our complicated social relations. We need to formulate a new social morality if our social life is to have the guidance which it needs.

This accounts for the moral impotency of the church. Its moral standards today are as antiquated as its theological formulas. It has failed to bring its moral judgments up to date. It has condemnation only for the crude elementary sins of ages ago. The church has not canught up with the temptations and transgressions of progress and prosperity. New varieties of sin have grown up with our evolving civilization, great glaring sins in our commercial and political relations which are darkening our skies, while the church continues to hammer away at the petty sins of generations ago. Its weapons against the modern sinner are about as effective as spears and arrows would be in a modern battle. The church is dazzled and paralyzed by the magnitude of offences. Our commercial and political giants play havoc with human rights on a tremendous scale, and it has not advanced ethically as far as they have financially, so as to classify their offences in such a way as to criticize and condemn them. On account of these new varieties of sin we need an annual supplement to the Ten Commandments; but instead the church lays emphasis where emphasis was laid centuries ago. It beholds sin in a false perspective, seeing peccadilloes as crimes and crimes as peccadilloes; straining out gnats and swallowing camels. It has never occurred to the church that sin evolves along with society and that the perspective in which it is necessary to view misconduct changes from age to age. Does anyone doubt that in this respect we need a new moral outlook?

III.

In the third place, we need to make morality the supreme concern of human life, to enthrone as the object of worship in our religion the moral ideal, and this of course means a new moral outlook. Let me show you as briefly as I can why we must make morality the very heart of our religion both for the sake of morality and for the sake of religion. In the past these two things have been more or less divorced. Religion in the beginning was little more than a method by which men gained the favor or warded off the enmity of the gods. There were friendly and hostile powers in nature, powers that were made into persons by the imagination of these early people; and religion was the reverence and awe which these persons naturally inspired. But this had practically nothing to do with the way in which men dealt with one another, which we call morality. One might take part in the religious rites and experience all the thrill of religious emotion, even though he disregarded the common moral standards. And this is the case today; religion is regarded as concerned with another realm than that of morality. Reverence and awe still go out to the divine persons, not to the laws of morality. That is why we find so many religious scoundrels, because to them religion and morality are as separate as religion and business or religion and amusement.

But once men realize that only those laws which contribute to the good of the community, which make it strong and happy, are the moral laws, they will realize also that as long as these are not observed it is foolish to sacrifice to the gods or pray for their favor. For instance it is silly to pray for health while breaking the rules which make for health; and it is silly to pray for social welfare while living the kind of life which contributes to social disintegration. On the other hand once they

realize that welfare and happiness are not arbitrary gifts from the gods, but the natural results of certain conduct on the part of men, then the natural order in which we live will become the real object of reverence and awe. The true reverence will be to revere right and justice; the true awe to have fear and trembling because everything not founded on right and justice will perish. In other words, when men become aware of what morality really means and involves, they will look upon it with something of that feeling and solemnity which previously characterized their attitude toward the gods. Or if you look at it from the standpoint of religion you reach the same result. The purpose of religion has always been to secure blessings for mankind. Its worship, its sacrifices, its prayers are all to this end. In the past and even today man's welfare was believed to depend upon the unseen, mysterious powers which in personified form peopled the air and the sky; and it was in such ways that their favor was won and their wrath averted. But when men see that the blessings they crave are based on other conditions; that these things are secured only as the result of a certain type of life; that there is no such thing as arbitrary action in the universe; but that everywhere in this world there is recognizable unchanging law—then what a change comes into the very heart of religion. The very ends which religion craves lead it to pay attention to the real conditions of life, to study the laws of the physical world upon which life depends; and then instead of praying or sacrificing for peace and happiness, instead of imploring Apollo or Jehovah, Allah or God to stop a pestilence, they search out and remove the cause of the pestilence; and religion instead of being separate from morality, becomes ethical and scientific. It believes that morality guided by science is its very life and soul, and thus becomes a real power in human life.

Of course there are many people who think that religion must be something more than a worship of this thing which they call "mere morality." But let us see. What is religion? There are many definitions for religion, but fundamentally religion is merely a set of feelings and a set of practices which result from those feelings. These feelings are practically always the same, no matter how different the objects which arouse the feelings may be. The objects of these emotions are different among different people or in different periods of man's development; yet in every case the feelings are very much the same. It is the same with the Roman Catholic dropping on adoring knees before the Blessed Virgin, and with the Buddhist gazing in homage upon the statue of Buddha, and with the Greek extending out his arms to Apollo, and with the savage standing mute before a sacred stone—yes, and with the rationalist, hushed and subdued as he thinks of those mighty laws on which the health and safety of life depend. So religion is not connected with any particular view of man or the universe. It is only necessary that there be something which gives rise to this deep peculiar emotion.

In like manner there is nothing in the nature of morality to hinder it from blending with religion. Morality is a way of acting rather than a way of feeling. But when we see that true morality is the way of life, and that immorality is the way of death to men and communities—then there is no reason why men, conscious of their responsibilities and of the great issues at stake, should not be touched with reverence and awe as they think of these things. In other words, there is no reason why morality should not be the object of these emotions; and if it is, then morality becomes a religion to man in the fundamental sense of the term. Just as surely as the fear or love of a divine person can be a religion, as for instance the worship of Apollo or of Jehovah was once a religion, as the imitation of Jesus or Buddha is now a religion, so can the worship of morality be a religion to man. Morality may be the very ideal which a man may seek all his life to follow. It may be the supreme law to a man. It may be the supreme passion to a man. Down on his knees he may bow before it, just as others bow before Jesus or before Buddha.

In this sense religion and morality may become one because religion is a general term, meaning whatever one holds sacred, whatever one venerates, whatever gives one his supreme rule of life. But what that shall be is a different question. Religion does not decide what it shall be. That is determined by a man's knowledge or lack of knowledge of the universe. Religion has nothing to do with knowledge. It is the feelings aroused by knowledge or the ideals which we otherwise acquire. From this point of view, morality—the laws of life—is simply one of the possible objects of religion. There may be other objects—indeed there usually are other objects—that is why morality and religion have been and are divorced. In fact other types of religion are so common that it is actually imagined that they alone are religion and that the man who sets up the moral ideal as an object of worship is not a religious man.

And yet I stand here this morning ready to reverse this thought entirely and thus preach a new moral outlook. I believe that in this enlightened age of the world the moral ideal is the only fit object of intelligent worship; that morality alone is fit to be a religion; that the prevailing types of religion are outworn and should be cast aside; that only so far as religion concentrates its worship upon the moral ideal has it any saving power. In fact I am willing to accept the jealous tone of the first commandment if you will let Righteousness speak instead of Jehovah. And Righteousness said: "I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no other gods before me." For if we are really earnest for human life, if we see it as the frail thing it is, dependent for its security, its happiness, even for its existence upon obedience to the laws of life, how can we be supremely concerned about anything but this obedience? What light is worth anything but the light of science which reveals to us those laws? And what feeling is worth anything but the feeling that makes obedience to them the supreme object of life? Of what use are all sorts of mystical emotions, all sorts of philosophical speculations, all sorts of scientific inquiries, if we have not the emotion necessary to keep us straight in our daily lives; if we have not an eye for cause and effect here and now; if we have not the real secret of happiness and peace from day to day? The religion that will teach us how to live; that will hold up clear and high the

laws of life and win our obedience to them—this is the religion the world needs, and it is the only true religion. All other religions, all that seek to make something else sacred, that cause men to put their trust in a church or a creed, in Christ or in God, divert man from the real issue—the real issue of obedience to the natural conditions of life. And so do we need this new moral outlook which enthrones the moral ideal as the supreme object of religious worship, and makes obedience to the moral law the supreme object of religious practice.

JOHN H. DIETRICH.

Montaigne*

Lovers of literature have sometimes lamented because we lack a universal language which might serve as a medium of common understanding among men.

I am not altogether in sympathy with this attitude. The language of every people seems particularly adapted to express their peculiar genius. The fact is that with the invention of the printing press, the spread of literacy and freedom of travel and communication, the worth while literary productions of one people become the common property of all.

This process of literary diffusion takes place in two ways: a knowledge of the author's language on the part of those born foreign to it, and through translations into other tongues.

The French language lends itself readily to many forms of literary composition. French authors are characterized as being lucid in expression, nimble in wit, and happy in the ability to express fine and delicate shades of meaning in terms of beauty and understanding.

No one has had greater influence in shaping modern French than the great master of French prose, Montaigne.

Four hundred years have elapsed since he first saw the light in the old Chateau du Montaigne in what is now the Department de la Garonde. The chateau still stands with its typical medieval round towers, with their conical roofs and crumbling outer walls.

Montaigne's life covered a wonderful period of European literary activity. Among his contemporaries were Shakespeare and the great Elizabethans in England, Cervantes in Spain, Comoens in Portugal, and Tasso in Italy.

His portrait in the Depot des Archives du Royaume in Paris impresses one by the height of the forehead and the indication of great brain capacity. His face is distinctly Gallic and strikingly intellectual. No one can mistake the type. He is a thinker, not a killer.

His advent into life was in a period of transition, and he was able to watch the dying embers of medievalism pale in the sunlight of the Renaissance.

He was profound in thought, modern in temper and versatile in achievement.

Most Americans know him through Emerson who wrote a sermon on him, labeled it an essay, and dubbed him "Skeptic," and forever placed him on the shelf of our memory with that title. The Concord Sage escapes our condemnation, however, by writing a fine sentence, saying, "Great believers are always reckoned infidels, impracticable, fantastic, atheistic, and really men of no account."

Incidentally Emerson was profoundly influenced by Montaigne and in admiration and forgivable imitation dubbed his own literary productions, "Essays." In his introduction to Montaigne he has recorded,

> A single odd volume of Cotton's translation of the Essays, remained to me from my father's library, when a boy. It lay neglected until, after many years, when I was newly escaped from college, I read the book, and procured the remaining volumes. I remember the delight and wonder in which I lived with it. It seemed to me as if I had myself written the book, in some former life, so sincerely it spoke to my thought and experience.

The enthusiastic Spaniard in his praise of Cervantes will tell you that in reading Don Quixote you may run the whole gamut of literary form in his language. There is a similar quality in Montaigne.

Using the essays as his literary medium we find in them philosophy, ethics, history, social usages, customs, humor, pedagogy, theology and natural history.

He was the most modern man of his age. He holds the mirror that reflects the sixteenth century and anticipates the twentieth.

Montaigne had a background of family and caste, a fact more important than some people like to concede. His father was a soldier in foreign lands, a man of education, traveled, familiar with polite society, and a seigniorial lord. Recognizing the natural ability of his brilliant son the elder Montaigne took pains to see that he was well tutored in the classical tongues and given the advantage of good schools.

At an early age Montaigne was taught to speak "pure Latin," and his taste for reading was formed early by having put in his hands the fables of Ovid's "Metamorphoses." Familiarity with Virgil, Terence and Plautus followed soon.

His father, having advanced ideas for the time concerning education, took pains to let his son's mind develop naturally, avoiding compulsion as much as possible.

Entering manhood, Montaigne, as the son of a gentleman, surprised his friends by choosing the law as a profession rather than following the bearing of arms.

It was in his chosen profession that he first attracted attention by showing an independence of mind and a progressive spirit in protesting against having laws for French speaking people written in Latin.

> What can be more strange (he said) than to see a people obliged to obey and pay a reverence to laws they never heard of, and to be bound in all their affairs, both private and public, as marriages, donations, wills, sales, and purchases, to rules that they cannot possibly know, being neither writ nor published in their own language, and of which they have, of necessity, to purchase both the interpretation and the use.

As counsellor of Bordeaux he began a work which is still engaging the legal labors of our lawyers, that is, the simplification and uniforming of laws, an augean, endless labor, which a divine Dante imposes as a penalty upon those who enact them.

One of the most interesting literary productions of Montaigne is the record of his travels through France, Germany, Switzerland and Italy when he was nearly fifty years of age. This book has a most interesting history. Written by his own hand, or dictated to

*Michel de Montaigne was born four hundred years ago, on February 28, 1533.—EDITOR.

a servant who acted as his secretary, it was put into a chest and forgotten until one hundred and eighty years after his death. Late in the eighteenth century Canon Prunis of Chancelade visited the old Chateau du Montaigne and discovered this delightful diary of travels, written in the inimitable style of Montaigne describing in detail the things he saw in the far old year 1580. He notes such facts as: the Germans turn to the left instead of the right when passing each other; in Italy the usage of images in the churches is a new custom, and criminals condemned to death are escorted to their place of execution by companies of gentlemen.

The breadth of Montaigne's views may be inferred from the fact that when among Calvinists, Lutherans and Huguenots he talks with their clergy and theologians and is interested in listening to their ideas and getting their viewpoint, a very unusual thing at that time for a Catholic French lord.

Montaigne was interested in education and anticipated many of our present-day methods. In his essay on the subject "Of the Education of Children," his comments and admonitions are thoroughly modern. He contends that the tutor should understand his pupil at the beginning of a course of instruction. He advocates letting the pupil have some choice and voice concerning the subjects taught, thus anticipating our modern system of electives. He recognizes that education is more than book knowledge and advocates travel and contact with men as a part of education. In delightful contradiction he points out the intellectual poverty of moderns who were prone in his day to borrow from the classics, while he continually quotes the Greek and Latin authors and refers to the heroes of antiquity.

These essays are a great treasury of literary lore which one ought to have on his book shelves that from time to time he may refresh his spirit.

How Montaigne gained his reputation as a skeptic is difficult to understand. He appears never to have lived up to his reputation. He unsparingly scathes atheism, and puts light value on the virtue of paganism. He is broad enough to recognize the good in his non-Christian contemporaries, and says,

> Compare our manners to those of a Mohometan or Pagan, you will find that we fall very short; there, where, out of regard to the reputation and advantage of our religion, we ought to shine in excellency at a vast distance beyond all others.

The question often has arisen as to whether he has any claim to be called a philosopher. As far as having any system of philosophical thought, or any grand conception of the universe he fails, but he was a philosopher in the sense of philosophizing concerning what we term the common things of life.

The whole field of human affairs is a subject for his thought, and he is perhaps the first man in Western Europe who saw the value of life in its many social manifestations.

The highest tribute a man can have is the trust and esteem of his neighbors, and as Emerson points out, in the times of civil war which Montaigne so deeply lamented, when every house was a fort, Montaigne kept his house open, the gates ajar, without defense, and he who would came and went at will, and everybody respected him.

GEORGE LINNAEUS THOMPSON.

Germany, Awake!
(March, 1933)

Germany, rouse, before it's late!
Shake off from you your nightmare—hate!
O, Goethe's Germany, arise
To answer all the Nazis' lies;
O, Schiller's Germany, with might
Challenge all the Nazis' spite!
For Israel once again is found
Hunted and harried, flogged and bound
(Because it is a sin to be
Kin to the One from Galilee)
Until it seems that Israel must call
Germany, too, her Wailing Wall;
And weep, as once, she was weeping on
Those ancient brooks of Babylon. . . .

Now once again is Judah come,
In Germany, on martyrdom;
Her food is grief; her drink is pain
On which she lives—and thrives again!
For, just as of old, no nation's wrongs
Could ever still King David's songs;
Just as no synagogue on fire
Could e'er consume dear Heine's lyre,
Goliath—Hitler, your venom'd dart
Can never reach Feuchtwanger's art!
And when forgot are your wretched rages,
Einstein's vision will light the ages!

Goliath—Hitler, hate you bring!
Beware the pebble from the sling!

LOUIS GINSBERG.

While the World Flounders

Caught on an island sinking in the ocean,
We build no raft or boat to serve our need,
But argue, with shrill plaints and dazed emotion,
How soon the encroaching waters will recede.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ.

Nocturne of 1933

West Twenty-third Street on a windy night;
At curb, a fiddler, with blown beard of white,
Who plied his plaintive bow with better cheer
At sight of lonely listener drawing near.
Almost a jig shrilled from the hopeful strings,
And stiff old elbows found some grace of wings.

A hearth aglow with ruddy flame should greet
The aged player, not this barren street;
Sweet children should be clustered round his knees
Beseeching bedtime tunes—"Ah Grandpa, please!"—
And to their smiles his merry violin
Would seem to bring the dancing fairies in.
Too soon that vision fades, and firelight dies,
Surrendering to the cold realities
Of wind and midnight, where the shelterless
Must plead with passer-by in hunger's stress.

His thanks for coin dropped in his dangling cup
Were followed by fresh tune his bow took up
That seemed to make the shivering street afraid—
Dear Heaven!—'twas "Home Sweet Home" the old
man played!

ELIOT WHITE.

Judas' Feet

The feet that trod the high priest's court
To bear a miser after gold
Wearily trod to the upper room—
And the gray dews of night were cold.

But Jesus washed his disciple's feet
And these with more than the usual care
Though nothing of water could quite cleanse
The stain of the dark pavements there.

"My Lord has washed these helpless feet
And pointed me out with a bitter sop.
I have betrayed his innocent blood."
See! On these feet the shekels drop.

RAYMOND KRESENSKY.

The Study Table

Russia and Armenia

"The Red Flag at Ararat" is a delightful book,* with a startling title which may scare some conservatives away from reading it. The author, an Armenian woman brought up in the United States, and active for years in the Y. W. C. A., went, in the spirit of a pilgrim rather than of a tourist, to visit the ancestral home of her race. She entered it from the north, in order to see something first of "the vast Russian experiment." She writes of the journey from Moscow to Erivan:

> The slow-moving train through the vast grain tracts of the Ukraine offered ample compensation for the monotony of the scenery by building up many valuable acquaintances. In my division there were two young Tartars from the republic of Azarbaidjan; an English gentleman and his niece, owners of extensive tea plantations in India, who were en route to Tiflis to advise the government on tea plantation experiments in the Caucasus; a Russian botanist from Leningrad; a Georgian engineer; a Ukrainian government official; a Ukrainian lady; and an Armenian writer from Moscow.
>
> After the evening meal this motley population gathered in the corridor and plunged into the great national Russian sport—animated conversation of the principles of capitalism vs. Marxism. I found myself conversing in all the four languages I could speak, English, French, Turkish and Armenian. The Georgian engineer, the Ukrainian government official and the Tartar youth were communists, members of the Party; the rest were "loyal" in varying shades and degrees, but all were genuinely interested in the new experiment and wanted to see it succeed.

She gives an amusing account of her criticisms upon Soviet policy and their answers, and adds:

> What amazed me most in this type of pastime, which we had night after night, was that no one objected to the noise we made, no matter how far into the night it lasted; on the contrary, those who had retired and gone to sleep, woke up after the first doze, and, finding the conversation too interesting to miss, joined in. After staying a while in the country, I found that this was typical of the "awakeness of the people" which the revolution had brought about.

She visited the three Transcaucasian republics, but devoted most of her time to Armenia. The present Armenia is a country about the size of Switzerland, the smallest in the chain of republics which now make up the Soviet Union. Miss Yeghenian is not a Communist. She sets down what she saw, and leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions. She saw beautiful public buildings, some finished, some now going up. She saw fine engineering, electrical and irrigation works, shown to her with great pride. She saw new villages rising, with the names of old ruined ones in Turkey from which the Armenians have been driven out. The Armenians in America and in France who came from each of these now forsaken villages, send the money to build a new one named for it, in Armenia. She found five hundred women studying medicine in the capital, Erivan—probably more than are studying it in the United States today. The government encourages women to become doctors, because they can go out into the villages and teach the women hygiene. She found 95 per cent of the children in school, and special attention paid everywhere to the health and education of the little ones. The kindergarten pupils went through charming and artistic songs and dances for her, some in Turkish, some in Armenian. She visited a prison; over there they call it a "House of Improvement." The prisoners are paid wages; they are taught to read if illiterate; they have clubs, classes, and a theatre (formerly the chapel), and a radio in every cell.

Most remarkable of all, she saw the racial feuds of centuries blotted out, and the lion and the lamb lying down together. The vexed question of national minorities, so troublesome elsewhere, seems to have been solved by encouraging them to cherish their own languages and their own national culture without interference.

She visited the famous old monastery at Etchmiadzin, the seat of the Catholicos, or head of the Armenian National Church. She says:

> The fury of anti-religious Soviet activity has not descended as heavily on the Armenian Church as it did on the Russian Church.

Its heads are democratically elected, and have been the champions and protectors of their people. Nevertheless, all the church property has been confiscated:

> Before the Revolution the Armenians the world over mentioned with pride—and now the communists point out with deep condemnation—the fact that the monastery at Etchmiadzin owned property to the value of 600,000,000 rubles, wealth second only to that of the Tsars.

Services are still held in the historic church, however, and the Catholicos still exercises spiritual influence.

She confirms other observers in reporting that prostitution has been practically wiped out:

> In comparison with scenes one has to witness in America and in all the big cities of Europe, the Soviet countries seemed like a graveyard when it comes to sex interest. . . . Whomever you ask, from the lowly workers to high intellectuals, if they are communists they will answer by quoting Lenin. In 1920, in an interview with Clara Zetkin, Lenin said:
>
> The Revolution demands concentration, the straining of all energies by the masses and the individual. The proletarian is an advancing class. He does not need drunkenness to deaden or arouse him, either through sexual intemperance or alcohol. Certainly thirst must be satisfied. But does a normal person, under normal conditions, lie in a street and drink from mud puddles? Or even from a glass that dozens of other people have been drinking from? But still more important is the social aspect of it. Drinking water is an individual matter. But two participate in love, and from it arises a third new life. Here the interests of society come in, and the duty to the collective must be considered.
>
> I do not for a minute want to preach asceticism. Communism must bring the joy of life and vigor which comes from the completeness of the love life. The excess in sex life so often observed at the present time does not, in my opinion, bring with it joy of life and vigor, but on the contrary lessens them. In time of revolution, this is very bad. Youth needs healthy sport—swimming, excursions, physical training of all kinds; a variety of mental interests—study, investigation, scientific research. A sound body makes a sound mind. We want neither monks nor Don Juans, nor yet the German philistine as the happy medium.

After only twelve years, Lenin's idea seems to be largely fulfilled:

> At present, the young people are so preoccupied with social duty, are so absorbed by the thrills of building a new country and keeping up a fighting spirit against all the world, that they seem to have no time or disposition left for excessive interest in love-making and all sorts of so-called "bourgeois pastimes."

But at the registry Miss Yeghenian found seven couples waiting to be married, and everywhere in Armenia she saw large families of children. She says:

> The total impress of this hopeful and buoyant life is very contagious while one is in its midst. Life values become completely reversed. The dearth of material things, even dire necessities, loses its overpowering grip on the imagination. Shabbiness of appearance becomes a trifle. How strange it seemed, while I was in Armenia, that once I walked the streets of New York for days in search of a becoming hat!

Few visitors to the Soviet Union penetrate as far

*The Red Flag at Ararat, by A. Y. Yeghenian. Published by The Woman's Press, New York City. $2.

as Armenia, and fewer can talk with the people in their own tongues. Miss Yeghenian talked with folk of all sorts, the high placed and the lowly, in the cities and the villages. Everywhere she was of interest as an American tourist; and everybody, from the street-car driver in Moscow to the Kurdish boy under the shadow of Mt. Ararat, had heard of Sacco and Vanzetti, of the lynching of Negroes, and of our 10,000,000 unemployed.

Miss Yeghenian is a member of the Bureau of Immigration and the Foreign Born of the National Board of the Y. W. C. A. Her professional work has brought her into intimate acquaintance with the life of people of many countries. She writes in a lively and entertaining style, and gives us a series of graphic pictures. On the whole, her report is exceedingly cheering, especially to those of us whose hearts were harrowed for many years by the news of the Armenian atrocities. She does not overlook the dark side of the present scene, the anti-religious campaign, the fanaticism, the dictatorship, the shortage of food in the north and of clothing in the south. But she says the watchword in Armenia today is "Reconstruction"; and the reconstruction has already gone far. The old Armenia used to be pictured as a black-robed woman mourning amid ruins. Miss Yeghenian was present at an enthusiastic celebration where the new Armenia was represented as a golden-haired laddie, ten years old, with smiling lips and shining eyes.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Correspondence

From an American Friend in Russia

Editor of UNITY:

. . . About the Five Year Plan in Four: if one looks at what has actually been accomplished in the four years he would see that it is not five years, but fifty that have been covered. Do you remember how we saw things in 1922? You remember that the little there was from the Czar's time had been utterly destroyed. Now, in 1932, it is difficult to tell all that has been achieved. I would say that Russia is a giant.

The standard of living now is not very high, but what of it? If you had to pay 90 per cent of your income for the building of your future and 10 per cent for your living, your standard of living would not be anything very wonderful. It's just this that is happening here now in Russia. We have to buy everything outside of the country, and Russia has to pay for it all with the things that she is actually producing. There is no credit arrangement, no borrowing as in other countries. How can you expect any high standard of living for the present? The home propaganda of the Government here all tends to exaggerate the shortcomings of what is being done, and therefore to darken the picture. If anything is not just right, you find half of the paper full of it, and the story always has a great effect. Nobody wants to be called a slacker or to have his work criticized. So everything is directed to keep the machine going. Nothing can happen here but "forward march" with the program for the future.

We have just been celebrating one of our great holidays here at the factory where 1,450 men and women are working. At the dinner for the employees I had to speak, and I related to them the story of the Pittsburgh steel strike, which came after the war when the steel magnates wanted to lower the wages of the workers. I told them how the Senate selected a committee to investigate the strike, and how the cry of "Bolshevism!" went up everywhere. You see, our Russian workers want to know how other very good workers live. I told them about our unemployment, and bread lines, the fear of tomorrow, insecurity everywhere.

The working men here are very happy since they know that nothing can be done at the factory without their voting on it. They are very well aware that they themselves are the bosses and that everything is done for the betterment of their conditions.

You know how I used to live in New York, and yet I am more happy here than I ever was before. I went away on my vacation not long ago and was gone for six weeks, two weeks traveling and four weeks at the Black Sea, at Levadia in the Crimea. I stopped at the Czar's palace, a most wonderful place. Here I met workers and managers of all the most important factories in the Soviet Republic. I can only say that it was an education for me, as I learned so much about Russia. The Czar was never so happy there as I was. The place is kept up as though for the Czar himself. I never saw a cleaner or more beautiful place. The medical staff is the very finest, and we were taken care of like little children.

On the 15th Anniversary of the Revolution I received from the factory workers a letter of recognition. This is like a key of the city presented by the mayor. I also received a 20 per cent raise in my wages, and I am now getting 540 roubles a month. I am a rich man, with no worry about losing my job or my money. There is nothing to worry about here in Russia. The Five Year Plan is a success and in the next five years great things will be accomplished.

Ustug, U. S. S. R. H.

Peace and the Idea of God

Editor of UNITY:

The report of "The Chicago Anti-War Conference" by G. B. Halstead in UNITY of Jan. 23rd, raises a question that I think we should endeavor to answer.

"There were six hundred and eighty students, representing over a hundred colleges and universities, twenty-nine states of the Union, five countries and numerous widely different types of social, political parties and views. . . . Rallied in a grim almost fierce struggle to muster a united front. . . . This Conference literally and actually fought for a program to help attain world peace.

"They could not agree on the wrongness of war, but could agree on bigger and better uses for it than in the past.

"This section of our youth but actually reflects the weaknesses and failures of our educational and religious institutions."

They could agree on the goal but not on the method of obtaining that goal. Why? What is it that determines our attitude towards life's problems? Our religion. And our religion is determined by our conception of Deity. Then it was the different concepts of Deity that made the disagreements.

But how are we going to have a universal concept of Deity when we are taught to believe that the whole of the Bible is the word of God?

In Genesis we see an angry God. When man sinned he drove him from his presence and cursed the ground on account of man's sin. In the New Testament we see an entirely different picture. We see God weeping over Jerusalem, longing to gather them in his arms. Yet he knew they thirsted for his blood. We see him associating with harlots, he was the friend of publicans and sinners. We hear him praying after they had nailed him to the cross, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

We also read in the Bible "that God is the same yesterday, today and forever." Which picture shall we believe? Christ said "the Father and I are one." So when we see Christ we see God, for he came to do the will of his Father. In Christ we can see all that the human mind can comprehend of God. The more we study his life and teaching, the more we know of his Infinite Love. "God is Love." Man has not accepted that idea yet.

When humanity recognizes a God of Love, then we will have a common base and can present a united front.

"God is an ideal existing in the minds and hearts of men with which they compare, judge and better themselves."

"Our actual belief in the nature and purpose of the Creator of the universe is the ultimate base of conduct."

Howell, Michigan. JOHN T. RICKETT.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 66)

service and educational efforts involving daily contact between high-caste and depressed class will be required of those working in the Movement, because at all costs it is necessary to assume and assert constantly equality of status. Some of the activities resolved upon by the Anti-Untouchability League at Shantiniketan included the formation of classes to remove evil habits (drinking, etc.), night schools and free studentships, a special fund for education, the organization of co-operative credit societies and industrial training and many other activities centering on specially Hindu customs.

The Movement as a whole has met with strong opposition from a small and highly orthodox group of high-caste Hindus especially associated with the Temples. In spite of numerous appeals, resolutions, petitions, and a referendum of Hindus in the particular vicinity of the Guruvayur Temple the Zamorin, who is trustee of the Temple, is still refusing to permit entry. Some of the temples cannot be thrown open because of the trust deeds, and it will be necessary to pass some legislative measures before this can be brought about.

It is a great movement, impossible to describe in a few words, but the spirit which has inspired it and which will sustain it to its ultimate fulfillment can be felt in the great words of the poet Tagore in which, when speaking of the Movement, he exhorts his countrymen to service—"The signs of a new age in India are unmistakable. The spirit of the time calls us. Let us respond to it and do our share in the work of reconstruction by throwing off the shackles of superstitution and the inhuman snobbery of caste. Let love be the center of our service and let its radiation illumine the entire atmosphere of our national life."—*India Bullletin* (London).

Munition Makers Corrupt Statesmen

We are indebted to the *New Outlook* of Toronto, the able journal of the United Church of Canada, for a report of an address by Colonel George A. Drew, a brave veteran of the World War. The sum and substance of the address the editor put in the sentence, "Munition makers corrupt statesmen." "One hates to think as meanly of his fellows," says the *New Outlook*, "as all this implies, but certain conclusions seem terribly inevitable."

In the address Colonel Drew, "no pacifist but a virile upstanding soldier," said that munition making is in the hands of "a great internationalized syndicate with no respect of persons." Japanese troops in Manchuria are shot down by munitions made in Japan. In the World War German troops were shot down by German-made artillery. In England, various munition-making firms have been combined into Vickers Limited. Clergymen, editors, statesmen, bishops, are among the stockholders. A minister of munitions declared the disloyalty of the firm almost unbelievable. Recently armament firms have been buying important newspapers in France, and have secured control of the *Journal de Geneve*, a paper of great influence. "Colonel Drew," said the *New Outlook*, "did not ask for defenselessness. He urged that such armed force as we find to be required should be trained and equipped with the utmost efficiency. But he did plead for the destruction of this wholly parasitic trade, menacing the honesty and peace of the nations."

We have had many revelations of the forces at work to stir up international trouble and block action by the Disarmament Congress. There is only one thing mightier than a munitions lobby backed by millions of money in many nations. It is public opinion. Men like Colonel Drew and journals like the *New Outlook* are helping rouse that public opinion.

—*The Christian Leader.*

New Organization for Freedom of Expression

A new organization, the Canadian Civil Liberties Protective Association, was organized on January 21st last in Edmonton, Canada, to protest against any encroachments of civil liberties in regard to freedom of speech and assembly, and kindred matters.

The Association is similar in its aims and objects to the American Civil Liberties Union, and no doubt friendly relations will be maintained between the two organizations.

The Association stands on the general principle that, for the promotion of orderly social progress, all thought on matters of public interest should be freely expressed. The punishment or suppression of mere expression of opinion without overt acts is never in the interest of orderly progress, and makes for violence and bloodshed. The association feels the principle of civil liberty embodied in our British traditions must be re-asserted in its application to conditions in Canada.

The organization is open to persons, irrespective of religious, economic, or political opinion, who agree to unite for the defense of civil liberties, wherever they may be challenged. Attacks on civil rights will be defended by protests to officials and newspapers, publicity, petitions, delegations to authorities, and legal aid.

The direction of the Association is in Edmonton in the hands of a provisional executive committee made up of Lieut.-Col. G. W. MacLeod, D.S.O.; Ella C. Timbres, Mrs. I. G. Ringwood, Mr. F. McLean, and Mr. A. Stiernotte. An Advisory Board of Canadian-wide scope is now in process of formation, and several persons of note in leading cities of Canada have signified their intention to act in that capacity.

The Association has already been successful in amending certain traffic by-laws in Edmonton in connection with application for parade permits.

Anyone desiring further information may get in touch with the Secretary, Ella C. Timbres, 11107 88th Avenue, Edmonton.

IMPORTANT!!!!

The March-April issue of

The New Humanist

includes the following significant articles, reviews and poetry

WHAT IS HUMANISM?
John H. Dietrich

PHILOSOPHY AND SHIRT-SLEEVES
Max C. Otto

RELIGION IN VARIOUS CULTURES
A. Eustace Haydon

THE UNIQUENESS OF MAN
Raymond B. Bragg

HUMANISM STATES ITS CASE
Edwin H. Wilson

A MAVERICK PSYCHOLOGIST
Maynard Shipley

THE CASE OF MR. BABBITT
Carl H. Grabo

THE EVOLUTION OF AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY
Oliver L. Reiser

THRUSH CLEAR
Julia N. Budlong

To neglect the New Humanist is to fail to keep abreast of the most important trends of modern thought.

Single Copy 20c Yearly $1.00
Foreign $1.25

105 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....